

293  
(5)  
REMARKS

On a late PAMPHLET, called,

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

EXAMINATION

Of A Book, entituled,

A BRIEF ACCOUNT of many of the  
PROSECUTIONS of the People call'd  
*Quakers*, &c.

So far as the CLERGY of the Diocese of  
*St. David's* are concern'd in it.

---

L O N D O N:

Printed and Sold by T. SOWLE RAYLTON and  
LUKE HINDE, at the *Bible* in *George-Yard*,  
*Lombard street*. 1740.

[ Price Six-pence. ]

# The Contents.

- S E C T. I.** *Remarks on the Defender's Introduction, and on his Misrepresentations of the Cases of the two Clergymen concerned.* pag. 3.
- S E C T. II.** *Remarks on the Reply of Thomas Philipps Vicar of Laugharne.* pag. 10.
- S E C T. III.** *Observations on the Reply of Tho. Williams Rector of Llanvareth, and on the three Remarks made in the Defence upon his Case.* pag. 37.
- S E C T. IV.** *The Conclusion, being an Appeal to the Reader's Judgment.* pag. 49.



---

---

## REMARKS

On a late Pamphlet, called

*A Defence of the Examination of a Book, intituled, A brief Account of many of the Prosecutions of the People called Quakers, &c.*

So far as the CLERGY of the Diocese of St. David's are concerned in it.

---

### SECT. I.

*Remarks on the Defender's Introduction, and his Misrepresentations of the Cases of the Two Clergymen concerned.*

THE *Defender*, in his first Section, represents the *Quakers* as "seeming to  
" be surpriz'd at the Observations of  
" the *Examiner*, concerning the *Largeness* of  
" the Diocese of St. David's, and the very  
" few Prosecutions that have been complain'd  
" of, as commenc'd there by Clergymen, viz.  
A " but

“ but *two* in *forty* Years.” “ They set out,  
 “ *says he*, pag. 2. with asking a Question,  
 “ What is all this for ? ” The reason of which  
*Question* is in their next Words, *viz.* “ What  
 “ has the *Quakers* Account to do with the  
 “ Extent of the Diocese of St. *David's* ? Their  
 “ Sufferings by 1180 Prosecutions had been  
 “ equally grievous, though not one of them  
 “ had been within that Diocese.” Upon this,  
 too clear for him to quote, was grounded what  
 immediately follows, and is by him cited,  
*Def.* pag. 3. *viz.* “ These Observations there-  
 “ fore of the *Examiner* are but artful Amuse-  
 “ ments, tending to divert his Readers At-  
 “ tention, from the main Point, to a Matrer  
 “ of no Consequence.” In citing which he  
 has omitted the Word *Therefore*, lest it should  
 prompt his Reader to ask *Wherefore*, and  
 thence discover the Reason by us given, and  
 by the *Defender*, not without Cause, concealed ;  
 for his Prudence might easily see, it would  
 have a shrewd Influence on his Answer to our  
 Query, *What is all this for ?* “ It was, *says he*,  
 “ in the *first* Place to shew *in general* how very  
 “ little Trouble the *Quakers* have met with  
 “ from any Persons whatsoever, in so large a  
 “ Diocese, for so long a Space of Time.”  
 Which *general* Answer is *no* Answer, unless  
 the *Quakers* general Complaint had been limi-  
 ted to that *Diocese*, which, he knows, it was  
 not. “ In the *second* Place, *says he*, it was to  
 “ shew *in particular*, how far so numerous  
 “ a Clergy have been for so long a Time,  
 “ from

“ from making any improper Use of the Laws  
 “ now in being.” Surely, we may here ask  
 again, *What’s all this for?* Can there be any  
 need of shewing that a *numerous Clergy* are not  
 guilty of what only *Two* of them are charg’d  
 with? The Charge, so limited, naturally sup-  
 poses all the rest innocent; the plain Conse-  
 quence of which is, that the Fault of those  
*Two*, who *have* made an improper Use of the  
 Laws in being, is aggravated in proportion to  
 the Number of good Examples of a numerous  
 Brotherhood, who *have not*.

The *Defender* proceeds, pag. 3. “ And con-  
 “ sequently, how poor the Plea is, that the  
 “ *Quakers*, after all their Search, can draw  
 “ from the Usage they have met with in that  
 “ *large District*, to induce the Legislature not  
 “ to trust the Clergy any longer with the *Be-*  
 “ *nefit* and *Assistance* of such Laws.”

That those Laws have not been necessary to  
 the *numerous Clergy* there, is apparent from  
 their general Disuse of them for so many Years  
 together; and that they have been neither  
*beneficial* nor *helpful* to those *two* who have  
 us’d them, is clear by their own Confessions:  
 The One of them complains of the Loss of his  
 Demand, with additional Charges and Ex-  
 pences, amounting to *Twenty four Pounds Two*  
*Shillings* and *Six Pence*, of which, says he,  
*Examination* pag. 15. “ I have not been reim-  
 “ burs’d one Farthing.” The Other of them  
 tells us, *Exam.* pag. 18. that “ he never had  
 “ one Penny of the *Two Pounds Fourteen Shil-*  
 “ *lings.*”



“ *lings*,” which he prosecuted and imprisoned the Widow for. ’Tis observable, that the rest of the Clergy there, who have not had Recourse to *such Laws*, have not complained of *such Losses*. Besides, the Use of those Laws carries a *Reflection* on the *Wisdom* and *Goodness* of those *Two* Clergymen, if they will believe one of the prime Patrons for the Clergy in the present Cause, who says, \* “ There is great  
 “ Probability that every *wise* Clergyman, for  
 “ his own Sake, and every *good* Clergyman,  
 “ in Compassion to his Neighbour the *Qua-*  
 “ *ker*, will take the easy and cheap Method  
 “ prescribed by the Act of the 7th and 8th of  
 “ King *William* the 3d, for the Recovery of  
 “ their Dues.” So that, in the Opinion of one of their own Advocates, those two Clergymen, so far as they have taken other measures, are neither *wise* nor *good*. This brings the Issue of the Affair into a very short Question, viz. *Whether two Clergymen, in this Diocese, neither wise nor good, ought to be trusted with a Power of oppressing their Neighbours, by such Laws, as the numerous Body of wise and good Clergymen there will probably never make use of?* This is a Question which disinterested Persons will hardly differ in the Solution of. This leads us to what the *Defender*, pag. 3. calls the *great Point*, which he says, “ is a  
 “ Repeal of certain Laws by which at present  
 “ the Rights of the *Established Clergy* are se-  
 “ cured ;

---

\* *The Country Parson's Plea*, pag. 38.

" cured ;" but he should have said, " A Re-  
 " peal of certain Laws, so far as respects De-  
 " mands recoverable without them," for that  
 only is the *great Point* : The Representation  
 made by the *Quakers* to the Parliament was,  
 " That there have been prosecuted in *England*  
 " and *Wales*, for Demands recoverable by the  
 " Acts of the 7th and 8th of King *William*  
 " the 3d, above Eleven Hundred of that Peo-  
 " ple, of whom near Three Hundred were  
 " committed to Prison, and several of them  
 " died Prisoners." To verify this Represen-  
 tation, from the Clergies Clamour against it,  
 as a bare *Surmise of the Quakers*, a Specifica-  
 tion of *Facts* was collected ; and the Force of  
 them is unavoidable, unless it can be proved,  
 either that the Prosecutions themselves were  
 not, or that the Sums demanded were not  
 otherwise recoverable. Where neither of these  
 is done, as in the Cases of these two Clergy-  
 men, the *main Point* is not attended to. Cir-  
 cumstances of least Consequence minister most  
 Occasion for Cavils and Controversy, and for  
 that Reason in bad Causes are most insisted on.

We had said, *Vindication* pag. 68, that the  
*Quakers Complaint was not of Clergymen* ; upon  
 which the *Defender* thus remarks, pag. 3, 4.  
 " How then came the Cases of these two par-  
 " ticular *Clergymen* to be under Consideration ?  
 " And what are the *Marginal Notes* put under  
 " the Cases of these two Clergymen, (as well  
 " as under the Cases of diverse others in their  
 " *Brief Account*) but Complaints and Enu-  
 " merations

“ merations of pretended Hardships and Sufferings brought upon *Quakers* by Clergymen ?

Had we form'd such general *Queries* from particular Cases, the Clergy would probably have imputed it to our Ignorance of *Logick*: But the *Defender*, we presume, is not ignorant, that this Way of *Reasoning*, tho' us'd by him, is altogether *reasonless*. He might as well have charg'd us with complaining against *all Mankind*: Let him but change the Word *Clergymen* every where in the foregoing *Queries* into the Word *Men*, and he will find them operate with equal Force. Away with such *Sophistry*! It proves nothing, except, what a *mean Opinion* the *User* of it must have entertain'd of his *Readers Understanding*.

*Def.* pag. 4. he charges us with “ dropping “ and suppressing in our *Appendix* those very “ material Words in the *Examination*, viz. “ Finding their Cases had been unduly represented in a Book presented to the Members “ of both Houses of Parliament.” Which *very material Words*, as spoken by *themselves*, introductory to their *own Defence*, have indeed no *Matter* in them, but *Matter of Form*, and are never accepted in Proof of any thing.

But the *Defender* would have us understand from those *very material Words*, that the *Incumbents* do undertake a *Confutation* of the *Charge* against them: Which yet the *Examiner*, in the *Introduction* to the *Examination*, has assured us, they don't so much as deny:  
His



His Words are, " That each of these *two Cler-*  
 " *gy men* did prosecute a *Quaker* for with-hold-  
 " ing from him his legal Dues, one in the  
 " Court of *Great Sessions* in *Wales*, the other  
 " in the *Ecclesiastical Court*, is not deny'd."  
 Do they undertake to *confute* what they do not  
 deny ? 'Tis plain, they deny not the *Charge*,  
 but cavil at some Circumstances attending it :  
 About which Word *Circumstances* the *Defen-*  
*der* has another Complaint against us, pag. 5.  
 that in quoting from the *Examination* this Pas-  
 sage, viz, " What is deny'd is this, that the  
 " *Quakers* have fairly represented the *Circum-*  
 " *stances* of the two said *Prosecutions*," We  
 have dropp'd the Word *Circumstances*. " The  
 " Reason of their so doing, *says he*, is left to  
 " the Reader to guess." For Removal of all  
 Doubt in this Case, we assure him and the  
 Reader, that the Omission of the Word *Cir-*  
*cumstances* was no more than an *Error* of the  
*Press*, and that we intended the Insertion of it,  
 may appear from our Words a little lower in  
 the same Page, viz. " We therefore proceed,  
 " *First*, to lay before him [the Reader] each  
 " *particular Fact* ; and *Secondly*, to consider  
 " the *Objections* of the *particular Incumbent*,  
 " to the CIRCUMSTANCES attending it."

We own our selves responsible for the Truth  
 of our *Marginal Notes*, all which were *impar-*  
*tially* inserted, as well, when in favour of the  
 Prosecutor, as when otherwise. Whether the  
 two Incumbents have disprov'd any Circum-  
 stance by us related, must be referr'd to the  
 Reader's

Reader's Judgment, when he shall have perus'd the following Sections.

---

## S E C T. II.

Remarks on the Reply of Thomas Philipps,  
Vicar of Laugharne.

**T**H E Circumstances, objected to by the Vicar, in the Case of *Daniel Williams*, were,

1. That the Vicar's Demand on *Daniel Williams* was about One Shilling and Six-pence.
2. That *Daniel Williams's* Son, not a Quaker, tendred the Vicar Five Shillings before any Prosecution began, bidding him, take his Due for his Father's Tithe, but the Vicar refus'd it, and replied, DANIEL *must suffer*.
3. That his (*Daniel Williams's*) Goods, worth about Twenty Pounds, were seized and disposed of without Appraisment.

I. To the *first* of these Circumstances, the Vicar objected, *Exam.* pag. 12. "that the  
" Bill he filed was for *Thirteen Shillings*, due  
" for the Tithe of Hay, Obventions and Ob-  
" lations, for a certain Number of Years."

To this we answer'd, *Vindication* pag. 75.  
that "Our Account related to his original  
" Demand before the Prosecution began; *his*,  
" to what he afterward declared for in the  
" Bill

## ( 11 )

“ Bill he filed, in which he might say what  
 “ he pleased, and have made a Claim, had  
 “ he thought fit, of twenty Times more than  
 “ his first Demand : That therefore the truth  
 “ of the Circumstance was not in the least af-  
 “ fected by his Narration of a different Claim  
 “ made by him at another Time, and on ano-  
 “ ther Occasion.” We also observ’d, (*Exam.*  
 pag. 76. in the Margin) that “ the Vicar’s  
 “ first Demand was only for the Tithe of a  
 “ little Hay, but that being refus’d him, he  
 “ inserted also in his Bill a Claim for Oblations  
 “ and Obventions for about a *Dozen* Years  
 “ back.

To which the Vicar’s Reply, *Def.* pag. 10,  
 11. is, “ What the Authors of the *Appendix*  
 “ mean, pag. 75. by the original Demand, I  
 “ do not understand, (there being but one  
 “ made, and that for *thirteen Shillings*) unless  
 “ the sending my Servant to REASON with  
 “ *Daniel Williams*, why he carried off the  
 “ Tithe of an Acre and half of Hay, in Hay  
 “ Harvest 1719, and the like Quantity in Hay  
 “ Harvest 1720, be deemed such. But al-  
 “ lowing this to be called a *Demand*, how  
 “ comes it to be valued at no more than *One*  
 “ *Shilling* and *Six-pence*? The Tithe due to  
 “ me in the Year 1720, was the Tithe of 3  
 “ Acres of Hay, (*i. e.* the Tithe of one Acre  
 “ and an half for two Years) and it is well  
 “ known to the Neighbourhood, that Hay  
 “ about this Town generally sells for *twenty*  
 “ *Shillings* an Acre. How then comes the  
 B “ Tithe



“ Tithe of three Acres of Hay to be valued at  
 “ no more than One Shilling and Six-pence ?

“ But that my *Demand* was for *thirteen Shil-*  
 “ *lings* is manifest, not only from the Bill in  
 “ *Chancery*, to which I appealed, pag. 12. of  
 “ the *Exam.* but also from the \* exprefs Te-  
 “ stimony of *Daniel Williams* himself, the  
 “ very Person of whose Evidence they have  
 “ made so much Use in the *Appendix*. For  
 “ in a Letter of *Daniel Williams* directed to  
 “ Dr. *Ottley*, then Lord Bishop of St. *David's*,  
 “ and dated from *Carmarthen* Castle the 6th  
 “ of the 6th Month 1722, (which Letter I  
 “ am ready at any time to produce) he tells  
 “ the Bishop that thirteen Shillings had been  
 “ demanded of him.

“ And since so much has been said of the  
 “ *Value* of my *Demand*, I take this Opportu-  
 “ nity of acquainting the Reader from what  
 “ Particulars my *Demand* arose. For the  
 “ *Tithe* of three Acres of Hay (Hay being sold  
 “ here for twenty Shillings per Acre) I de-  
 “ manded *six Shillings*; and for Money due to  
 “ me for Oblations, &c. I demanded *seven*  
 “ *Shillings*, and these Sums added together  
 “ made my *Demand* to be *thirteen Shillings*,  
 “ which

---

\* *The Vicar in the Margin of his Defence p. 11.*  
*cites from Daniel Williams's Letter to Bishop Ottley*  
*these Words, “ The Vicar sent his Servant, and a Man*  
*“ with him to my Shop Window: I being there, he de-*  
*“ manded of me, if I would pay his Master Tithe-Offer-*  
*“ ing. I asked him, how much it was, and he told me*  
*“ thirteen Shillings.”*

“ which was the very Sum I pray’d might be  
 “ paid me, in my Bill in the *Court of Great*  
 “ *Sessions.*”

By this *Reply*, it seems, the Vicar does not understand what we mean by the *original Demand*, unless we mean, what indeed we do mean, *viz.* That he sent his Servant to demand 1s. 6d. of *Daniel Williams* for Tythe of Hay. He indeed calls it “ sending his Servant to *reason* with *Daniel Williams*, why “ he carried off the Tithe.” The Reader will easily determine, whether a *Demand* of the Money, or \* *Reasoning*, was the Servants more probable Errand. The Vicar himself too is so condescending as to allow us to call it a *Demand*. His Words are, “ Allowing this to be “ called a Demand, How comes it to be valued at no more than *one Shilling and six Pence?*” The Reason is plain; because it does not appear to have been any more, and because the Vicar produces no Manner of Proof to shew, that either the Quantity or Value of *Daniel Williams’s* Hay, was what he talks of. ’Tis observable too, that the Vicar don’t say a Word of his Servant’s Reasoning about *Obventions* or *Oblations*: Those Claims seem not to be then thought of, but inserted after-

B 2

ward

---

\* *Had this Reasoning been the Business, it would not have been beneath the Vicar to have went himself. For, the producing substantial Reasons against a Man’s carrying off the Tithe of his own Hay, would be no Dishonour to the Abilities of the most learned Clergyman in Wales to undertake.*

ward, with an Advance of his Claim for Tithe, to give the more plausible Appearance to his Bill in *Chancery*, in which his original Demand of *one Shilling and six Pence*, would have look'd very diminutive.

The Extract of *Daniel Williams's* Letter to Bishop *Ottley*, dated near two Years after the *Vicar* had enlarg'd his Claim and fil'd his Bill, proves nothing, unless it be, that the *Vicar*, at another Time, sent his Servant and a Man with him, to make a Demand different from his *first*, and agreeable to the Bill he determined to prefer: This Letter bears date from *Carmarthen Castle*, the 6th of the 6th Month, 1722, near a Year after *Daniel Williams's* Commitment thither, and about three Months before his Discharge: Had the *Vicar* been pleased to have also communicated what the Bishop writ or said to him upon the Subject of that Letter, it might probably have enabled his Reader to judge, whether the subsequent Release of *Daniel Williams* proceeded from the *Vicar's* own *meer Motion*, or at the pressing Instances of his *Diocesan*.

His Enumeration of the Particulars which the Sum claimed in his Bill arose from, has no Relation to his first Demand, but may be useful to demonstrate, what an Heap of \* tri-  
vial

---

\* Had the *Vicar* been particular enough in this Case, we should perhaps have found the greater Part of his Demands sued for, arise from the Accession of Groats and Two-pences, under the Name of Easter Offerings, &c.



vial Pretensions a Man resolv'd to ruin his Neighbour will collect, to make his Claim seem of some Importance.

What we have said may suffice to shew, that the Vicar has not prov'd any Misrepresentation in the *first* Circumstance, viz. our saying, "That the Vicar's Demand on *Daniel Williams* was about *One Shilling and Six Pence*."

II. We come next to the *second* Circumstance, viz. "That his (*Daniel Williams's*) Son, not a *Quaker*, tendred the Vicar *five Shillings*, before any Prosecution began, bidding him take his Due for his Father's Tithe, but the Vicar refus'd it, and replied; *DANIEL must suffer*."

The Vicar's Objection to this, *Exam.* pag. 12, 13. was, "I utterly deny that ever any Tender at all was made to me by the Son of *Daniel Williams*, either *before* or *after* the Commencement of the Action; for I never had any Conversation with him, and consequently could never make him such a Reply as that mention'd in the *Brief Account*, *DANIEL must suffer*. The Tender made was *subsequent* to the Action, and was not made to me by *Daniel Williams* or his Son."

To this, our Answer, *Vind.* pag. 76, 77, 78, was, "In this he plainly acknowledges the Tender made, and denies not the mentioned Reply, which are the most material Points  
" in

“ in this Circumstance : But he denies that  
 “ either the *Tender* was made to him by, or  
 “ the *Reply* made by him to, the Son of *Daniel Williams* ; “ for, *says he*, I never had  
 “ any Conversation with him,” which last  
 “ Words seem to us evasive, and designed to  
 “ screen his Denial from the Imputation of  
 “ Falshood ; for *Daniel Williams’s* Son might  
 “ send the Money tendred either by his Wife,  
 “ or some other Person, and the Vicar might  
 “ send his Reply by the same Person ; and  
 “ ’tis well known, that in such Cases, a Man  
 “ is usually, and in common Acceptation,  
 “ said to do a Thing which he employs another to do for him. In which usual Sense,  
 “ *Daniel Williams’s* Son might properly enough  
 “ be said to make a *Tender*, and the Vicar to  
 “ make a *Reply*, without having any immediate Personal Conversation one with the  
 “ other. But the Vicar says, *the Tender was*  
 “ *made subsequent to the Action*, whereas the  
 “ *Quakers* Account says, it was before any  
 “ Prosecution began : Here is a seeming Difference, but easily reconcileable, because  
 “ the Plaintiff probably dates the Commencement of his Suit from the Time he gave Orders for it, and the Defendant from the  
 “ Time he was served with the *Process* : Between which Times this Transaction might  
 “ happen, and occasion an innocent Variation  
 “ in their Report of it, without any Falshood  
 “ justly imputable to either of the Parties.”

The Vicar in his Reply to this, *Def.* pag. 8. declares himself "greatly surprized" to find us asserting, that "he plainly acknowledges " the *Tender* made," though nothing can be plainer than his own Words before cited, *viz.* " The *Tender* made me was *subsequent* to the " Action." What does he mean by the *Tender*, if not the *Tender* of *five Shillings* which we spoke of? For there was no Debate about any *other Tender*. He indeed cavils about the Circumstances of that *Tender*, *viz.* the *Person* by whom, and the *Time* when it was made. He denied that the *Tender* was made him by the Son of *Daniel Williams*. But he has not yet denied what we said, *Vind.* pag. 77. " that " *Daniel Williams's* Son might send the Money tendred, either by his Wife or some " other Person," and that " in such Cases a " Man is usually said to do a Thing which he " employs another to do for him." If the Vicar will plainly say, that the *Tender* was neither made by *Daniel Williams's* Son, nor by any Person sent by him; it will be incumbent upon the Vicar to specify the Person's Name who made it without his Order. When he does that, which we think, he cannot, let him insert that Person's Name instead of *Daniel Williams's* Son, and he will find his Cause not one Tittle either better or worse than it was before. Of so little Consequence is all his Cavilling upon this Point.

As to the *Time* of the *Tender*, which is more material, he says, *Def.* pag. 8. " I take  
" this



“ this Occasion of declaring exprefly, that  
 “ neither the Perfon they name, nor indeed  
 “ any one elfe, ever made me any *Tender* be-  
 “ fore the Profecution began.” But this muft  
 be explained by what he fays in the next Page,  
 where, upon obferving that he “ probably  
 “ dates the Commencement of his Suit from  
 “ the Time he gave Orders for it,” he replies,  
*Why, fo moft certainly he did:* And farther, up-  
 on a Review of his Papers, fays, “ I can af-  
 “ fert from them, that I had actually given  
 “ my Directions to my Sollicitor about taking  
 “ out a *Subpæna* againft *Daniel Williams*, before  
 “ any *Tender* whatfoever was made to me.”  
 Here he is either inconfiftent with himfelf, or  
 his exprefs Declaration fhould have been,  
 “ That neither the Perfon they name, nor in-  
 “ deed any one elfe, ever made him any *Ten-*  
 “ *der* before he had actually given Directions  
 “ to his Sollicitor about taking out a *Subpæna*.”  
 But this, though it appears to be the utmoft  
 he can assert from all the Papers he could come  
 at, would import no Contradiction to what we  
 have faid. Directions to profecute are no Pro-  
 fecution. To fhew that the Profecution was  
 begun, he muft fhew that a *Subpæna* was ac-  
 tually taken out and ferv’d. If he can’t do  
 that, though we are not willing to charge him  
 with direct Falfhood herein; yet, ’tis evident,  
 that his *Earneftnefs* to contradict *our* Affertion,  
 has betray’d him into a *grofs Negligence* of his  
*own*.

Upon

( 19 )

Upon our quoting a Letter of *Daniel Williams*, saying, "the Tender was made before he was served with the *Subpœna*," the Vicar smartly queries, "Why therefore did not the Authors of the *Brief Account* publish their Relation in *Daniel Williams's* Words? Why are Words of a different Import \* *joisted* in instead of those he had given them? Why are the Words, *before he was served with the Subpœna*, chang'd into the Words, *before any Prosecution began*?" We can assure him that Change of Expression was no politick Contrivance: And had not his Sagacity discover'd the Difference, we should still have thought the Words, as to *Daniel Williams*, to be of one and the same Import. Is not the Defendant's being served with a *Subpœna*, to him, the very first Step of a Prosecution? Every-body, the least acquainted with such Proceedings, knows it to be so. He was therefore right in dating the Prosecution from the first Act of it: But the Vicar was not so, in dating it from an Action of his own, which he must know to be only *preparatory* and *antecedent* to it. If therefore he will not admit this Difference, between him and us, to be an innocent Variation; the *Fault*, not to say the *Falshood*, is imputable to himself only.

Def. pag. 10. "It could not be in reason expected, that the Vicar should accept of  
C " the

---

\* *From what Elegant Author did the Vicar borrow that Word?*

“ the *Tender* after he had sent for a *Subpæna*,  
 “ and had put himself to Expence on that  
 “ Account.”

But it does not appear, to have been then too late to countermand his Orders for a *Subpæna*, without Charge, and if not, it might have been reasonably expected he should. However, we appeal to himself, well instructed by his own Experience of this Suit, Whether it had not been more reasonable for him to have accepted the *Tender*, even with sustaining the Loss of a *Subpæna*, than to have carried on a long Suit, vexatious to himself, and ruinous to his Neighbour; and in the End sit down (if we may credit his own Account, *Exam.* pag. 15.) with the Loss of *Twenty Four Pounds Two Shillings and Four Pence*, of which, *he says*, “ I have not been reimburs’d one Farthing.” Had the Restriction we desired taken place twenty Years ago, it would have sav’d him a very large Expence, which, if he rightly consider, may reasonably induce him to wish us Success in our next Solicitation.

The Vicar is farther charged in the *Brief Account* with saying to the Person who made the *Tender*, DANIEL *must suffer*. This Charge he before seemed to evade, but now expressly denies, and says, *Def.* pag. 8. “ I do declare “ that I never used the Words they charge me “ with to any Person whatsoever.” He also calls it, pag. 7. “ A very unkind Reply, and “ such an one, *says he*, as, I think indeed, I “ was not capable of making to any one.”

This



This Plea is very extraordinary. The Man, who *actually* made DANIEL *suffer*, pleads, that his tender Disposition was incapable of an Expression so unkind, as DANIEL *must suffer*. As if it were *more* unkind to *say* the Thing than to *do* it: Suppose it were doubtful, which we doubt not, whether he ever said, DANIEL *must suffer*, will not his own Actions determine the Point against him, when 'tis apparent to every body, that he forthwith proceeded to make DANIEL *suffer*? Does the *Unkindness* of saying DANIEL *must suffer*, bear any proportion to that of actually making him suffer fifteen Months Imprisonment, and the Sequestration of his Estate, both real and personal? Suppose it had been as *false* as 'tis *true*, that the Vicar had said he *would* do what he afterward *did* do; would not the Thing *done* be a good Bar to his *Action* of Scandal for *saying* he would do it? We here leave the Vicar intangled in a Net of his own making, and proceed to

III. The *third* Circumstance, which is,  
 “ That his (*Daniel Williams's*) Goods, worth  
 “ about 20*l.* were seized, and disposed of with-  
 “ out Appraisalment.”

To this the Vicar, *Exam.* pag. 13, 14, said,  
 “ The Goods sequester'd, (to the best of my  
 “ Remembrance) were one Feather-bed, a  
 “ small Quantity of Pewter, half a Hide of  
 “ Sole-Leather, five wooden Stools, and o-  
 “ ther Lumber, so far from being worth 20*l.*  
 “ (as is asserted in the *Brief Account*) that in

“ fact, they were not worth 5<sup>l</sup>. But besides,  
 “ not one Pennyworth of them was *disposed of*,  
 “ (as is asserted in the *Brief Account*) nor were  
 “ they either schedul’d or apprais’d, but left  
 “ in the House ; which was broken open the  
 “ third Night after the Sequestration was per-  
 “ formed, and the Goods were taken from  
 “ thence by the Son and Daughter ; of which  
 “ I had strong Proof, several Neighbours hav-  
 “ ing seen them in their Possession : So that I  
 “ was advis’d to indict them for Burglary and  
 “ Felony, but I wav’d the Prosecution.”

To the *former* Part of this we answer’d,  
*Vind.* pag. 79, that “ The best of the *Incum-*  
 “ *bent’s* Remembrance is not to be depended  
 “ on for the proof of an *Inventory* : Nor is it  
 “ at all probable, that his Memory can retain  
 “ a *true one*, of Goods, which, himself says,  
 “ were neither schedul’d nor apprais’d. By  
 “ his telling what he *remembers*, no Man can  
 “ discover how much he has forgot : And  
 “ where the Quantity is uncertain, the Value  
 “ can not be fixt. The *Quakers* had their Ac-  
 “ count from the Sufferer, or his Family, who  
 “ knew both the *Quantity* and *Worth* of their  
 “ own Goods. Whether their *Knowledge* at  
 “ the Time of the Sequestration, or the *In-*  
 “ *cumbent’s* Memory, seventeen Years after,  
 “ carry the greater Evidence of Truth, an or-  
 “ dinary Capacity may easily determine.”

And to the *latter* Part of it, we oppos’d the  
 Testimony of *Daniel Williams* in a Letter,  
 dated, *Carmarthen Castle* the 12th of the 9th  
 Month

Month 1722, viz. "After the Sequestration  
 " was executed, the House and the Goods se-  
 " questred, the House was lockt up, and the  
 " Goods therein, the Parson did not proceed  
 " publickly to appraise the Goods, but of a  
 " sudden in the Night-time the Goods were  
 " carried away, and the Door of the House  
 " left open against the next Morning. *Daniel*  
 " finding the Door open, by his Orders his  
 " Son took Possession of the same, the said  
 " *Daniel* still in Prison."

The Vicar's Reply to this is observable,  
*Def.* pag. 14. he says, "As to the Value of  
 " the Goods, the Valuation of them, which  
 " I published, *Exam.* pag. 13. was what I had  
 " from \* one of the Persons who made the  
 " Seizure." When, as the Truth of the mat-  
 " ter is, he published no *Valuation*, unless he  
 " will call it a Valuation of the Goods, to tell  
 " us, what a very *small Part* of them, by him  
 " enumerated, was *not worth*. And in Support  
 " of his own Assertion that they were *not worth*  
 " 5*l.* he now engages to produce a Certificate  
 " signed by several Neighbours, that they were  
 " *not worth Ten*. Who can withstand the Force  
 " of such Demonstration ?

He will not dispute, that "the Sufferer  
 " could give the best Account of the Quantity  
 " and Particulars of his own Goods," and yet  
 " says,

---

\* Perhaps he has forgot, that in the Examination,  
 what he said on this Point, was "to the best of his  
 " own Remembrance."



says, he “ cannot agree with the Authors of “ the *Appendix* (in what they never said) that “ the Sufferer was a proper Person to put a “ Value on his Goods.” But surely he won’t deny what they did say, that “ the Sufferer “ and his Family knew both the *Quantity* and “ Worth of their own Goods.” Nor that their Knowledge, who knew the *Quantity* and *Particulars*, imparted at the Time of the Sequestration, is a better Evidence of the *Worth* of them, than his Memory, who knew *neither*, 17 Years after ; or than the negative *Certificate* of Persons, adventurous enough to deny the Value of Effects, without knowing the *Quantity* and *Particulars* of them.

As to the Disposal of the Goods, he said, *Exam.* pag. 13. that “ not one Pennyworth of “ them was dispos’d of, nor were they either “ schedul’d or appraised, but left in the House, “ which was broken open the third Night after the Appraisment, and the Goods were “ taken from thence by the Son and Daughter.” Though indeed, nothing appears, but his *Say-so*, to shew that the House was broken open at all, or that the Son and Daughter knew any thing of the Affair, till the next Day, when the Door being found open, the \* Son by his Father’s Direction took Possession of the House. The Vicar indeed says, “ The “ Son and Daughter made a forcible Entry,” But how the Son’s going into the House, when the

---

\* See the Letter cited, Vind. pag. 80.

the Doors were open, can be called so, we do not understand. Until he prove such forcible Entry by the Son and Daughter, we shall consider it as a Fiction of his own Invention.

The Vicar, unable to prove that the Son and Daughter took away the Goods, takes the Liberty to pervert our Words to make us prove it for him, and says, *Def.* pag. 15. "That  
 " they were guilty of the Fact is *now* (it seems  
 " 'twas not *before*) apparent, from their Flight,  
 " for the Authors of the *Appendix*, pag. 84.  
 " are pleased to tell us, That upon Notice  
 " given them of the intended serving of *At-*  
 " *tachments*, the Son and Daughter also were  
 " obliged to leave their Habitations, for fear  
 " of Imprisonment." Could the Vicar have produc'd any colourable Proof of what he had said against the Son and Daughter, he need not have had Recourse to so barefac'd a Perversion. What we said concerning their *leaving their Habitations*, related to *Attachments* intended to be served, as well against the Father, as the Son and Daughter, for keeping Possession of the Frechold; and had no manner of Relation to the taking away the Goods. And, indeed, had they been guilty of *Burglary* and *Felony*, as the Parson, *Exam.* pag. 14. unjustly insinuates; the taking out of *Attachments* had been an unheard of Method of Proceeding in Case of those Offences. If the Reader will be pleased to review the *Appendix* to our *Vindication*, pag. 82, 83, 84, he will plainly see what a mean and pitiful Subterfuge the Vicar has Recourse to on this Occasion.

In the *Appendix*, pag. 81, we produc'd part of a *Letter* from *Daniel Williams*, wherein he says, HE NEVER HAD ONE FARTHING'S WORTH OF HIS GOODS THAT WAS TAKEN AWAY. Upon this the Vicar, *Def.* pag. 16. queries, "Does *Daniel Williams* really say true in the said Complaint, printed *Append.* pag. 81. in *Capitals*? I have very good reason to think otherwise; for I have lately, and since the Publication of the *Appendix*, been credibly inform'd, that most of the Goods were restored to him, and that they were sold by *Daniel Williams* himself: And this I have heard from one who knows the particular Circumstances of Time, Place, and Persons."

Here's a nameless hear-say Story brought to prove a Man a Lyar. Let the Vicar measure his Practice herein by his own Rule, *Def.* pag. 21. "This sets out with an Hear-say. — "I have been informed,—and deserves no Regard." Again, pag. 19. "What is there that the *Quakers* (the Vicar) cannot accuse Men of, if they (he) be allowed the Privilege of bringing in for Witnesses Persons *whom they do* (he does) *not name*." How forcibly does his own *Censure*, causlessly thrown at us, recoil upon himself!

The Vicar farther observes, *Def.* pag. 16. that "The Surmise, *Append.* pag. 80. seems odd, not to say ridiculous, *viz.* 'Twas suppos'd that the Persons concerned in executing the *Sequestration*, ashamed to make a publick



“ publick Appraisalment, and Sale of the Goods,  
 “ to avoid the Reproach of the Neighbours,  
 “ carried them away privately by Night.”  
 Upon this he queries, “ But why should they  
 “ be ashamed? Did they not act under Au-  
 “ thority?” As if all Offices acted under  
 Authority were equally reputable: Had those  
 Goods been publicly sold, would the Vicar  
 have willingly been present at such Sale? would  
 not the Reproach of the Neighbours have made  
 him blush? Would not his Conscience, of their  
 censuring his Actions as “ unworthy a Mini-  
 “ ster of the Gospel of Peace,” have made  
 him uneasy? Does not the Art and Shuffling  
 he uses, to cover the real Severity of the Prose-  
 cution, shew, that he has yet more Modesty  
 remaining than publicly to justify it, though  
 acted under Authority? But the Vicar adds,  
 “ Their Order was (not to appraise, but) to  
 “ keep the personal Effects in their Hands and  
 “ Possessions.” And did they not do so? Did  
 they not take the Goods into their Possession by  
 Night without appraising? ’Tis apparent the  
 Vicar has not yet prov’d any one of his Sug-  
 gestions to the contrary. But he cavils at our  
 saying, *The Goods were dispos’d of*; and calls it  
*an equivocal Word*, though we think it a soft and  
 favourable Word, considering the Action it  
 was apply’d to; because some Persons, not  
 wholly ignorant of the Law, esteem that pri-  
 vate taking away the Goods, without either  
 scheduling or appraising, to be an illegal Act,  
 D and

and properly to be described by a Term more harsh than the Word *dispos'd of*.

We hope we have now fully shewn, how weakly the Vicar supports the Objections he made in the *Examination* to the Circumstances related in our *Brief Account*.

We are next to consider an Objection made in his Reply to a fresh Circumstance, *viz.* That “ *Daniel Williams’s* Freehold Estate seized, “ was worth about *Eighty Pounds*.” In order to prove it over-valued, he tells us, *Def.* pag. 17. that “ he has lately had the Perusal of several Writings belonging to that Estate.” What are they ? “ *One Writing, says he, is* “ a Lease for 99 Years from *Richard Reynolds* “ to *Daniel Williams*, both of this Town, of “ an old Cottage at the Yearly Rent of *Twelve pence*, and a *Præmium* of *Two Pounds* and “ *Fifteen Shillings*.” This Writing concerns not the present Value, the old Cottage being gone, and a new House built. “ The *second* “ Writing, says the Vicar, is dated three “ Years after, when *Daniel Williams* had re- “ built it, and is a Deed of Purchase for the “ Sum of Three Pounds ten Shillings.” This Writing too proves nothing of the Value of the House, which, no doubt, was dearly purchased by the Charge of building it. “ The *third*, “ says he, is a Lease and Release of the Premises from the said *Daniel Williams* to “ *Sarah Pierce*, Widow, of this Town, for “ the Sum of *THIRTY Pounds*.” And now  
to

to use the Vicar's own Words, we hope, this modest Objector will not resent it, if he be asked these Questions: Is not the Freehold Estate to this Day subject to the heavy Incumbrance of the Sequestration? Has it not been sold much the cheaper because of that Incumbrance? Is not the Title to it, during *Daniel Williams's* Life, precarious, by reason of the Sequestration? Cannot the Vicar, were he inclined to revive the Trouble, Charge, and *Odium* of such a Proceeding, turn out both the Old Man and the Widow, and take Possession of the Premises himself, by Virtue of the Sequestration? And are not these Reasons alone (which yet we think are not all) fully sufficient to cause a very large Deduction from the real Value of the Freehold? Is the poor Old Man, under such Circumstances, obliged to accept *Thirty* Pounds for an Estate otherwise worth *Eighty*? And may he not possibly be reduced to want that Bread in his extreme Old Age, which the other *Fifty* might have bought for him? And does not all this proceed from his not being in the legal Possession of his Freehold, and from a Want of Power legally to dispose of or sell it, during the Sequestration?

As to the Costs of Reference which the Vicar speaks of, *Def.* pag. 17, 18. whether paid him or not, we think that the Order of Court for paying them, made above two Years after the Sequestration, is an additional and plain Proof that the Vicar did *then* oppose the discharging the Sequestration, and did then procure



cure the Continuance of it, and that he was very much mistaken in saying, *Exam.* pag. 14. and in repeating, *Def.* pag. 20. "That *Daniel Williams* has continued there (*viz. upon his Freehold*) ever since, without any manner of Disturbance given, Claim made, or Threats used by *my self*." Upon this Repetition of his, he must also give us leave to repeat from our *Vind.* p. 84. "How the Vicar can reconcile these Words with such Proceedings, we cannot conceive, unless by this mean Evasi- on, that those Things were not done by him- self, but by his *Lawyers*."

Having throughly considered all the Vicar's Objections respecting the Case we published, we shall next attend to the other Passages of his Reply. Wherefore we return to pag. 11. where he says, "I am obliged to the Editors for giving Transcripts of the *Mittimus*, of the Order for *Recommitment*, and of the Order for *Sequestration*." 'Tis well that we have oblig'd him, and that he is sensible of it. But what Use does he make of this Favour? He tells us, "These Transcripts verify what he said, *viz. that Daniel Williams* was committed for Contempt of the Court." Who ever doubted that? But did not the original Cause of that Commitment arise from the Vicar? Or in the Words of our Queries, *Append.* pag. 88. "How came he (*Daniel Williams*) under the Cognizance of the Court? Was it not by means of the Vicar's Bill for  
" Matters

“ Matters of Tithe, or *pretended* Right? ”  
 To which we added another Query in the very  
 next Words, which the Vicar honours by his  
 passing by it in profound Silence: ’Tis this,  
 “ Were not the several Orders of the Court for  
 “ his (*Daniel Williams’s*) Imprisonment and  
 “ the Sequestration of his Estate, obtained up-  
 “ on the Motion, and at the Request of the  
 “ Plaintiff’s Council? ” He has not cited  
 this, because he knows the *Transcripts* we  
 oblig’d him with, do fully answer it; for the  
 Orders of Court, both for the *Recommitment* and  
 the *Sequestration*, expressly shew, that they were  
 issued upon *Motions* and *Allegations* made by  
 Mr. *Morgan Owen* being of the Plaintiff’s  
 Council. This sits close upon the Vicar, nor  
 can he avoid the Force of it, unless he shall  
 make it appear that his Council in this Affair  
 mov’d without Directions, and without a Fee;  
 which his Solicitor’s Bill of 20*l.* 9*s.* 4*d.* gives  
 us no reason to suspect.

*Def.* pag. 12. The Vicar says, “ He did  
 “ believe, and does believe, that the Limita-  
 “ on in Cap. 6. of the 7th and 8th of King  
 “ *William* the 3d. which directs the Complaint  
 “ to be made within two Years, made his  
 “ Case not to be within the Jurisdiction of the  
 “ Justices.” But that Limitation can be no  
 valid Plea, unless the Vicar was indeed igno-  
 rant of their being any other *Act* for Recovery  
 of his Claim without such Limitation: Nor is  
 his *Way of thinking* about the *Act* of Parlia-  
 ment he mentions, any Excuse for his refusing  
 a Method

a Method directed by other *Acts* which he does not mention.

*Def.* pag. 18. He seems offended at a Passage in our *Vind.* pag. 83. viz: "What Motive induced the Vicar on a sudden to release *Daniel Williams* out of Prison, himself best knows: He might perhaps apprehend some impending Inconvenience to himself by continuing him there?" His Reply to this is, "The Vicar, who himself best knows what the inducing Motive was, does assure them, that what they have suggested was not the Motive; for the Vicar had nothing to fear from *Daniel Williams* or his Friends." Did any body ever say or suggest that he had? But it may not be improper here also to remind him, of what we have herein before observed, pag. 14. "That he has not communicated to his Readers what Bishop *Ottley* said or writ to him on the Subject of *Daniel Williams's* Letter."

*Ibid.* He is again offended at our "imputing the Prosecution it self to a Principle of Revenge;" not considering that 'tis almost impossible to do otherwise: Let him but reflect, how very absurd it would be to impute such a Prosecution to a Principle of Love and Goodwill, or of common Christianity? *Charity* it self in its utmost Extent can't reach that Length without destroying *Knowledge*.

We come next to what the Vicar, *Def.* pag. 19. calls "loading him heavily." What's this heavy Load which he so heavily complains of?



of? 'Tis an Extract from a Letter occasionally writ to *Daniel Williams* at the Time, and upon the Subject of this Prosecution, and inserted in our *Vind.* pag. 83. in which are these Words, " He, *meaning the Vicar*, declares, he will be " a *President* for the *quashing* such a *foolish* " Religion, for his *Brothers* the Clergy." The Writer of that Letter is not nameless, for his Name is subscribed to it, and it has all the visible Marks a Letter can have of being genuine. The Vicar, who sometimes talks of *uncandid Suggestions*, is so very candid himself, on this Occasion, as to declare, " He vehemently suspects us of quoting Letters which " never were writ." But this Suspicion, arising from his own Jealousy, and his Ignorance of us, we can't help. We would publish the whole Letter with the Writer's Name, could we be well assured that it would not occasion Discord between the Vicar and his Neighbour, who, for ought we know, may have some Dependence upon or Interest in him. However, that it may appear such a Letter was writ, any Person that desires it, upon three Days Notice given to the Printer of these Remarks, and upon reasonable Assurance that he will not expose the Writer's Name to the Vicar, shall have the Liberty of reading it. And the like Satisfaction, on the same Terms, shall be given respecting any other Letter or Paper by us refer'd to. But how does the Vicar defend himself against the Charge in this Letter? Only by saying, " To justify my self, as to this " particular,

“ particular, against the nameless Writer, (if  
 “ such an one there was) I am ready to declare  
 “ upon OATH, if I am called to it, that I ne-  
 “ ver made any such Declaration, as that, which  
 “ I am charged with in that Passage.” This  
 looks hasty: His Readiness to take a negative  
 OATH on such an Occasion, can add very lit-  
 tle to the Reputation of his *Veracity*: 'Tis to  
 be hoped, he will never be called to it, but if  
 he should, let him consider, that he cannot be  
*secure* as to the Truth of what he swears to, in  
 such a Case, without an impossible Assurance  
 that he cannot possibly have forgot the Words  
 he spoke seventeen Years ago. The *positive*  
*Letter* we cited carries with it an Evidence su-  
 perior to such a *negative Testimony*.

The Vicar's next Effort is, by destroying  
*Daniel Williams's* Credit to establish his own:  
 A Practice so ungenerous, that he seems to go  
 about it with Reluctancy; “ I am sorry, *says*  
 “ *he*, *Def.* pag. 20. to find my self driven by

“ the *Quakers* to say it in my own Defence,”  
 and then proceeds, under this *Semblance of Sor-*  
*row*, to say concerning his Neighbour more  
 than he has proved to be true.

*Def.* pag. 21. The Vicar objects to 3 Let-  
 ters by us cited, all which we insist upon to be  
*genuine and true*.

“ The first of these, *says he*, is said to be a  
 “ Letter from *Daniel Williams*, dated the 22d  
 “ of the 3d Month 1723, *Append.* pag. 81.  
 “ and sets out with an Hearsay, *I have been in-*  
 “ *formed*, and *deserves no Regard*.”

But

But we think it does deserve some *Regard*, because the Times and Circumstances of that and the other two Letters do so concur as mutually to support and confirm the Credibility of each other. The first Letter relates to a Report, after the Affizes, of his being to be turned out of the House, and put in Prison again, and respects a Matter then intended, which his *next* Letter dated three Months after, *viz.* 22d of the 6th Month 1723, shews was attempted, and wherein he says, " This Day the Priest sent his Lawier, and his own " Servant, and another Catchpowl \* to my " House, and they would very fain have persuaded my Children to go out of the House, " and because they would not do as they " would, the Lawier took my Daughter with " Violence to drague her out." This Attempt not succeeding, *Attachments* were taken out against *Father*, *Son* and *Daughter*, as appears by the *third* Letter, writ by a Person well acquainted with the Vicar's Proceedings, about the 27th of *October* 1723, which Letter the *charitable* Vicar suspects we have forged. But so consistent are those Letters, and attended with such Circumstances, that the only *Ground* they have left for *Suspicion* is their *Contradiction* to the Vicar.

E

Lastly,

---

\* The Vicar's "then Servant, James Brown," seems to have learnt of his Master, flatly to deny, what probably he may have forgot.



*Lastly*, He objects to another Letter, cited in the *Append.* pag. 80, viz. A Letter from *Daniel Williams* dated 12th of the 9th Month 1722, that "In this pretended Letter *Daniel Williams* speaks of himself no less than twice in the third Person, as, *Daniel* finding the Door open, and the said *Daniel* still in Prison." This is so far from a Proof of the Letter's being a pretended one, that 'tis rather a Proof of its Reality. The Vicar may assure himself that the Transcriber of the Passage saw that Impropropriety, and yet did not alter it. The Letter came from *Daniel Williams*, the *Extract* of it is taken *verbatim*: *Daniel* was then in Prison, and the Letter, though signed by him, might not be written with his own Hand: And we appeal to the Vicar himself, whether he thinks *Daniel Williams* to be a Man of so much *Learning*, as that such an *Impropropriety* as this could not escape his *Notice*.

We now willingly submit, what the Vicar, *Def.* pag. 21. says he *must submit*, viz. "the Genuineness and Truth of those Letters to the Reader's Consideration."

Here we take our Leave of the Vicar, wishing him well, and that he may henceforth enjoy the *Happiness* of a *peaceful* and *quiet Life*, free from *Law Suits*.

SECT.

## S E C T. III.

Observations on the Reply of Thomas Williams  
*Rector of Llanvareth, and on the Three Re-*  
*marks made in the Defence upon his Case.*

**T**HIS Rector, *Exam.* pag. 17. declared, that he “ had *always* used the *Quakers* “ with the *utmost Gentleness.*” Upon this we observ’d, *Vind.* pag. 91. that “ this *always,* “ respecting *Jane Lloyd,* could not be true, “ unless we accept her Prosecution and Imprisonment for an Act of his *utmost Gentleness.*”

In the Beginning of his Reply, *Def.* pag. 22. he changes his Expression, *utmost Gentleness* into *great Gentleness,* which shews, that we have convinc’d him that his former Expression was not justifiable, and therefore he was under a Necessity of substituting another in its Stead, before he could venture to say what he now does, “ I hope the Publick is convinced “ that it has been true even as to her.” Under this Turn of Expression he would still retain his Word *always,* which yet he must part with, for it cannot be true, that he has *always* used *Jane Lloyd* with *great Gentleness.* Was it *great Gentleness* which cited her into the Court at *Brecon?* Was it *great Gentleness* which procur’d her being declar’d *Contumacious* for

not appearing there in the Depth of Winter, when the Floods were dangerous? Was it *great Gentleness* which mov'd for and obtained a *Certificate* of that Contumacy? Was it *great Gentleness* which apply'd for a Warrant from the Justices upon that Certificate? Was it *great Gentleness* which sent her to Goal by virtue of that Warrant? That all these Acts were true, he denies not: Neither do we deny, that he used *Jane Lloyd* with *as much Gentleness* as is consistent with the Truth of them. But that so many Actions of Severity are consistent with *always* using *great Gentleness*, seems to us a singular Opinion of the Rector of *Llanfair*.

But how comes the Rector, if he indeed thinks the "Method of the *Ecclesiastical Court*," which he proceeded in, to be a Method of *great Gentleness*, to declare, *Def.* pag. 23. that "he had Recourse to it contrary "to his natural Inclination?" If the *Method* be contrary to his Temper; 'tis a Reflection on his own good Nature to call it a *gentle one*.

The next Thing the Rector objects to is, that "the Authors of the *Appendix* call the "Measures he then took *precipitate Measures*." But why did they call them so? Because his Applying to the *Ecclesiastical Court* seemed *rash* and *hasty*. He mentions but once going to her House with a Constable, and finding her Doors shut at that Time, never went more, but *rashly* and *hastily* put her into the *Ecclesiastical Court*. But he will not admit the *Measures* he took to be *rash* and *hasty*, "for, says he, first, I did  
" not



“ not take that Course to recover my Dues  
 “ till after the Way by Distress had been tried  
 “ and found to be ineffectual.” But how did  
 it appear *ineffectual*? By the Doors being shut;  
 and his not going again when they *were open*,  
 and when it might have been *effectual*. And  
 “ Secondly, *says he*, when I did go into ano-  
 “ ther Way, I proceeded with great *Gentle-*  
 “ *ness*.” Here he uses the Word *Gentleness*,  
 not for *Compassion* or *good Nature*, but for  
*Slowness*; adding, how much Time past be-  
 tween the *Summons* and *Citation*, and betwixt  
 the Date of her *Contumacy* and her *Confinement*.  
 But we can’t easily discern how the *Slowness* of  
 such a Proceeding lessens its *Severity*. He al-  
 so says, “ Had it not been for the Incumbent’s  
 “ *Gentleness*, a proper Complaint might have  
 “ been made of the Goaler, who was *certainly*  
 “ punishable for suffering this.” But then it  
 would also *certainly* have appeared that the  
*Gentleness* was the Goaler’s, not the Incumbent’s;  
 so that the Rector’s *great Gentleness*, with which  
 he *always* used *Jane Lloyd*, after all his Talk  
 about it, amounts to this, That he was so *gen-*  
*tle* to the Goaler as not to prosecute him for  
 his *Gentleness* in giving her some Liberty. But  
 the Reader may observe, that when the Rec-  
 tor, *Exam.* pag. 18. said, “ She never return’d  
 “ to Goal,” He said more than he could then  
 possibly know, if his own next Words be true,  
*viz.* “ Nor did I ever hear a *Tittle* of her  
 “ since.” Certainly he could not know whe-  
 ther she returned to Goal, or continued a Pri-  
 soner

soner at large, without ever hearing a *Tittle* concerning her.

The Rector has one Complaint more, which is, that “ the *Quakers*, it seems, will not allow that their Brethren are at all obliged to him for what he has done for so many Years in screening them from Trouble from the Parish-Clerk.” And to make them sensible of this Obligation, says, “ that by Custom immemorial all Inhabitants of the Parish of *Llanvareth*, above the Age of Sixteen, ought to pay, and Time out of Mind have paid, certain Annual *Dues* (he should have said *Demands*) to the *Sexton* or *Parish-Clerk*, and that “ this is actually the *Custom* and Usage of all the Parishioners (the *Quakers* only excepted) to this Day.” His other Parishioners may (for ought we know) have been *customarily* imposed upon ; but what’s that to us ? We shall inform the Rector of an *older Custom*, on condition he will keep it to himself, and not tell his Parishioners of it. ’Tis what we have met with in a Passage cited from Bishop *Stillingfleet’s Ecclesiastical Cases*, pag, 131, 132. *viz.* “ There were of old several *Clerks* belonging to the Church, and they were all *maintained* by the *Minister* at his own \* *Charge*.” If this *older Custom* be right, the Rector, instead of being, as he says, at an Annual Expence one Year with another  
“ of

---

\* See a Pamphlet entitled, The Exactions and Impositions of Parish Fees, by Francis Sadler, p. 21.

“ of *Eight or Nine Shillings* out of his Pocket,” on account of the *Quakers* not paying the Parish-Clerk, is really a Gainer of all that Money into his Pocket, which the Parish-Clerk receives from *other People*, toward that Maintenance the Minister ought to allow him.

We come next to consider the *three Remarks* made on the Case of the Rector of *Llanvareth*.

I. “ It is plain, *says the Remarker, Def.* pag. 24. that the Method of going to the Justices, which was first tried by the Clergyman, proved utterly ineffectual, through the Opposition made to the Execution of the Laws by the *Quaker*.” Though he might with more Justice have remarked, that the Rector made the Experiment but once, and that the Reason he succeeded not, was, his Coming when the Doors were shut; and it does not appear that she shut them in any Opposition to the Warrant.

He proceeds to remark, that “ the *Quakers* speaking of her (*Jane Lloyd's*) refusing to open her Doors to let in the Persons who came to execute the Warrant, add, *Append.* pag. 93. *Which she might well do as unwilling to be accessory to the Seizure of her own Goods.*” From this Passage, which he calls an *unguarded one*, the Remarker fancies he has made a deep Discovery. “ From the Behaviour, *says he*, of *Jane Lloyd*, and what the *Quakers* have thrown out upon it, he must  
“ be



“ be blind indeed, that does not see, should  
 “ the *Quakers* ever obtain the Law, which  
 “ they so much desire, what kind of Treat-  
 “ ment the Clergy may expect to meet with  
 “ from them.” The Danger suggested with  
 all this Formality is only, that if the Persons  
 who come to execute a Warrant, find the  
 Doors shut, the *Quakers* will not open them  
 to let them in. Certainly, neither Law nor  
 Reason would expect they should. But in such  
 a Circumstance, the Persons shut out have a  
 sure Remedy at hand : For the Law can give  
 Authority to open them : But there’s no need  
 of that ; for, let the Persons but come again  
 when the Doors are open, and they may be  
 assured, from the constant peaceable Practice  
 of the *Quakers*, that they will not shut them  
 to keep them out : Which is as kind a Re-  
 ception as such Guests will ever expect, if the  
*Parson himself* be not *with them*. How a Be-  
 haviour, so entirely passive, can be constructed  
 “ a keeping themselves upon the watch, mak-  
 “ ing Persons attending with Warrants wait  
 “ from Time to Time, and resolving to tire  
 “ them out,” the Remarker perhaps may un-  
 dertake to explain ; but till he does, his pre-  
 tended Discovery must pass for no other than a  
 frivolous and groundless \* Infination.

His

---

\* The Remarker is here so mean, as to throw a  
 Stone at a particular Person: His Words are, “ It  
 “ is not unlikely, that when the *Quakers* them-  
 “ selves shall reflect upon it, the Person employed  
 “ by

II. His *second* Remark, *Def.* pag. 26. begins thus, "The Reader will observe with  
 " what Degree of Candour the Clergy are  
 " treated by the *Quakers*." 'Tis with as great  
 a Degree of *Candour* as the Actions of those  
 Clergymen will admit; and we have no better  
 Rule to judge by. If without reasonable  
 Trial of an easier Method they proceed hastily  
 to a severer, we call it *precipitate*, and whether  
 the Rector of *Llanvareth* did not so, the  
 Reader may be able to judge, when he shall  
 have compar'd his *Answer* with our *Vindication*,  
 and his *Reply* with our *Remarks* thereon.

F

We

---

" by them to write their *Vindication*, may meet  
 " with a Censure from his Principals for imma-  
 " turely blabbing out a Matter, which, for the  
 " present at least, a more wary Advocate would  
 " have made a Secret of." *The Remarker, in this*  
*Point, seems so ambitious of appearing wise, that he*  
*feigns a Secret, where none is, to plume himself with*  
*the Reputation of discovering one; and causlessly charges*  
*another Person with Unwariness, to make himself seem*  
*subtle. The Person who writ that Vindication takes*  
*this Opportunity to assure the Remarker, that he*  
*never writes any thing but what is agreeable to his own*  
*Sentiments; that he dares discover his Thoughts*  
*without fear of any Man's Censure; that he is under*  
*no Temptation to do otherwise; and that he would dis-*  
*dain to serve any Principals of so mean Principles as to*  
*expect it of him: In a Word that there is not a Cler-*  
*gyman in the whole Diocese of St. David's, that stands*  
*in less Awe of his Diocesan, than that Writer does of*  
*his Principals.*

We are call'd, by this kind Remarker,  
 " Unkind Interpreters of the Actions of our  
 " Neighbours," only for saying that " there  
 " could not be a clearer Demonstration of *Ma-*  
 " *lice* than a rigid Procedure after several  
 " Years Premeditation." Is not this true?  
 The *Examiner* don't deny it; and yet calls it  
 an *harsh way of Judging*; as if there could be  
 a milder way of Judging, than from the clear-  
 est Demonstration. And yet the Remarker  
 expresses " a Degree of Concern that there  
 " should be, at any time, Instances of so harsh  
 " a Way of Judging to be found in a Coun-  
 " try of Christians." And queries, " How  
 " can such a Liberty of construing Men's Ac-  
 " tions, and presuming to dive into the very  
 " *Secrets of their Hearts*, ever be reconciled to  
 " that excellent *Gospel* Rule of *doing* as we  
 " would be *done by*?" We meddle not with  
 their *Hearts*, but their *Fruits*, their most *pub-*  
*lick Actions*; and leave every Man at Liberty  
 to make the best Interpretation he can of those  
 Actions, conducting his Judgment by that ex-  
 cellent *Gospel* Rule, *Ye shall know them by their*  
*Fruits: A good Tree cannot bring forth evil*  
*Fruit.* Are *Prosecutions* at Law the *Fruits* of  
*Love* and *tender-heartedness*? Is the Imprison-  
 ment of a poor Widow the Fruit of *Christian*  
*Charity*? Are these Things reconcileable with  
*doing* as Men would be *done by*? 'Tis possible,  
 that a *Way of Judging*, capable of *answering*  
 these Questions in the *Affirmative*, may be  
 found in a Country of *Christians*: But he that  
 shall



shall publickly so declare his Judgment, can scarce give a clearer Evidence of his being no more than a nominal *One*. The Remarker farther queries, "Would the *Quakers* like it, " that any Actions of theirs, though capable of " a good Interpretation, should yet be blacken'd " with a *bad* one? " Such a *Query* as this is not properly applicable to any Actions but such as are visibly *indifferent*, and therefore in the present Case can be of *no Force*; because the Actions we speak of are so visibly evil, that to call them *good*, would be an *evil* Interpretation, and to call them *evil*, is a *good* one.

III. The inquisitive Remarker fancies, *Def.* pag. 27. that he has found a Key to unlock another Cabinet of the *Quakers* Secrets, and says, " it may prove a Key to the right understanding of diverse Passages in their *Brief Account*." What's this Key? 'Tis an imaginary Meaning he would fix to " this Expression, *continued Prisoner*, or *remained Prisoner*," which, he says, " is to be found more than *fifty Times*, and in above *fifty Cases* in the *Brief Account*." The reason of which is that so *many Times* and in so *many Cases* the Expression is strictly true: 'Tis so in the Case of *Jane Lloyd*, who, we say, *continued Prisoner about six Months*. The Remarker tells us, that " the Incumbent denies this to have " been fact," but refers not to any Passage, either in his *Answer* or *Reply*, wherein he denies it; nor indeed can we find any. We therefore

fore think, he does not deny it, but cavils about it when he says, *Exam.* pag. 18. " She " was taken to Goal, but in less than one Month " I found her to be at Liberty to go where " she pleased, which I connived at, resolving " not to trouble her any farther : She never " return'd to Goal, nor did I ever hear the " least Tittle of her since." In saying this, his Expression is larger than his Knowledge. His first Words, " She was taken to Goal," he indeed may certainly know to be true, for in that only does he appear to have had any Concern : But his saying " he found her at " Liberty to go where she pleased," is a Mistake ; for the Liberty granted her was to go only where the Goaler pleased, even into the closest Confinement at his Call. This Liberty of a Prisoner, is the Liberty the Incumbent says, " he connived at, resolving not to trouble her any farther." He had already troubled her sufficiently in sending her to Goal, and the Connivance he talks of, is only that he did not prosecute the Goaler for giving her Leave to go home, and which, he says, pag. 23. " The Goaler was certainly punishable for " suffering," which certainly is a Proof that she was all that Time his Prisoner. The Inconsistency of the Rector's saying, " She never " return'd to Goal, &c." we have already shewn in pag. 39 foregoing.

But, says the Remark, *Defence* pag. 28. " The *Quakers* are called upon to make out " their *Six Months* ; and how do they make " them

“ them out ? ” As plainly as can be : By assigning, *Vind.* pag. 94. the Time of her Commitment, and the Time of her Release ; the Former in the Month called *May*, and the Latter in *November*, 1726. The *Remarker* does not gainsay either the Time of her *Commitment*, or the Time of her *Release*, nor that the Time between them was about *six Months* : But this Revealer of Secrets tells us, that “ By  
 “ this we must mean (what neither we nor  
 “ any Body else can avoid Meaning) that it  
 “ was so long before she was legally discharg-  
 “ ed from Prison.” Is it possible for the Time  
 Persons *continued Prisoners*, or *remained Pri-  
 soners*, to be better proved, than by assigning  
 the Time of their *legal Commitment* and the  
 Time of their *legal Discharge*, which Times  
 respectively are the Beginning and End of every  
 Imprisonment : By this most clear and most  
 plain Proof, we conducted our selves in com-  
 puting the Time in the several Cases related.  
 But the *Remarker*, in Defiance and Contempt  
 of all Proof, cavils on thus “ So that the true  
 “ Meaning of these Words, *continued Prisoner*  
 “ about *six Months*, comes out at last thus, Not  
 “ that *Jane Lloyd* was literally in Prison, or  
 “ was actually confin’d so long : No ; but that  
 “ she might have been so long imprison’d,  
 “ had it not been for the *Connivance* and *Le-  
 “ nity* of the Prosecutor.” When as the very  
 Truth of the Case, confirm’d by the plainest  
 Proof, is literally as we express’d it, that  
*she continued Prisoner about six Months.* She  
 Was



was *literally* sent to Jail by the Incumbent ; she was *literally* a Prisoner till her legal Discharge thence, which was about six Months after. If at any Time she had (as the Incumbent *Def.* pag. 23 inform'd us that he was inform'd) the Liberty to go home ; 'tis certain, the Incumbent, who knew of that Liberty but by Information, had no hand in granting it : She must have been, not only as she was, *literally* a Prisoner, but she must have been *literally* in Prison ; she must have been *literally* close confin'd all that Time, had it not been for the *Mercy* of the *Goaler* : But what's that to the Incumbent ? As to any Act of his, she continued *literally* in Prison where he put her. He don't so much as pretend that he gave any Directions for her Liberty ; nor does he appear to be in any wise concerned therein. But the *Remarker* to make him seem so, ascribes to him the Action of another Man ; and to shew himself an able Defender of the Clergy, adorns the *Incumbent* with the *Goaler's Lenity*, and then exhibits him to the World as a Pattern of *great Gentleness*.

We here observe, that we neither did, nor do, know any thing of the *Goaler's Favour* to *Jane Lloyd*, but what the Incumbent has related. So that the *Remarker's* applying that particular Circumstance, to the Words, *continued Prisoner*, even in her Case, is not just : But to apply *that* Circumstance, which we know nothing of, to our Expressions in *other* Cases, under the Name of our own Interpretation

tion, is very unjust : Nor does it in the least lessen the *Severity* of the Prosecutions to shew, that in some particular Cases, the *Goalers* were more favourable than the *Prosecutors* desired they should be.

---

## S E C T. IV.

### The Conclusion:

We now appeal to the Readers Judgment,

I. **W**HETHER the Persons concerned in *Defence* of the Two forementioned Cases, have not by *mean Evasions* and *unnecessary Cavils*, vainly endeavour'd to avoid the Force of *plain* and *undeniable* Accounts?

II. Whether the Prosecutions and Imprisonments of the *Quakers* by those two Clergymen, have not had a natural Tendency to detract from their Estimation among other Men, respecting the *Character* they affect to bear, of being *Ministers of the Gospel of Peace*?

III. Whether, if the Restriction desired by the *Quakers*, had many Years ago been granted, it would not have been beneficial to these Two Clergymen ; 1. By saving them much Trouble and Charge in carrying on Prosecutions ineffectual to the Recovery of their Claims:

Claims : 2. By keeping their own Reputations free from the Blemish incurr'd thereby : 3. By preserving the *Characters* of a numerous Brotherhood in the Diocese of St. *David's*, from the Reflections naturally arising by Means of the Misconduct of those *Two* ?

IV. Whether the Judgment of the numerous Clergy of that Diocese (these Two only excepted) concurring to disuse these Methods for 40 Years together, be not a reasonable Proof of their being to them unnecessary ?

V. Whether it be reasonable or equitable to indulge the Passions of those *Two*, in the Use of Methods, refused by their *Order* in General, detrimental to themselves, and reproachful to their whole Fraternity ?

VI. Whether the Tithes, demandable by Law, either by the Clergy or Others, be not better secured to them by *one, uniform, short, easy and certain* Method of Recovery ; than by having recourse to a variety of Prosecutions, *tedious and expensive*, to Themselves and Others, dishonourably *severe*, and in the End oftentimes ineffectual ?

---

F I N I S.



